**SHACKLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

 **Minutes of a Meeting held 20 April 2009 in the Village Hall**

**Present** – Bridget Carter- Manning (Chairman), Fran Nowlan (Vice Chairman), Diana Kirkillo-Stacewicz, Jon Scott, David Preston (Clerk), Richard Mangnall (Clerk to Peper Harow Parish Meeting) and 41 members of the public, from Shackleford and Peper Harow.

**01/09 Apologies for Absence** – Fred Bourne.

**02/09 Proposed Development of Shackleford Mushroom Farm Site** – The Chairman outlined the proposals contained in the Planning Application which had been submitted, and explained that the meeting had been called for the Parish Council to hear residents’ views on the proposals before determining its response to the proposals.

In response to questions from the Chairman the majority of those present agreed that, if a new agricultural use for the site could not be found, suitable residential development was acceptable. The Chairman then invited comments under a number of headings, and the main points made were as follows:

Size of Development - It was widely felt that 25 units were far too many, as it would create a disproportionately large influx of new residents into a small Village. The proposed Development would create a relatively large Estate in an AONB and Green Belt. An informal vote suggested that opinion was equally divided between favouring a development of 5-10 units and 10-15 units. One person indicated support for 15-20 units, and no-one for a higher number.

It was generally felt that there had been a total lack of Community consultation since the Developers’ public exhibition in May 2008.

Number and size of properties. – It was noted that there was a reasonable mix of house sizes proposed for the privately owned properties, though a higher number than was considered appropriate. The need for so many ‘affordable’ units for local people identified by the Housing Needs Survey was questioned, and a figure of five or six was felt to be nearer the mark.

Design of individual properties – It was felt that the proposals would result in a bland uninteresting modern estate, with a quality of design far removed from that of existing surrounding properties. An essentially suburban Development was inappropriate for the location.

Layout of site and positioning of property types – Fears were expressed that the two access roads to the site could be joined up to create a ‘rat run’, although this was not planned. The suitability of the location for ‘affordable’ housing was queried, since there were only limited amenities available in the Village. The proposed grouping together of all the ‘affordable’ units was felt to be unfortunate, but it was recognised that issues of ease of management needed to be considered .

Lighting – It was unanimously agreed that no street lighting should be provided, to make the Development in keeping with the Village. There was some feeling that low level lighting should also be omitted from the plans.

Vehicle access – The proposed entrance road from Shackleford Road was very narrow and vehicles would be unable to pass one another. This could result in vehicles having to reverse into Shackleford Road, where sightlines were reduced, and such manoeuvres would be dangerous. The prospect of additional traffic on Peper Harow Lane was not welcomed – this being narrow and with a dangerous junction at Elstead Road.

Traffic in the Village – It was felt that the forecasts of additional traffic movements were lower than is actually likely, especially when tradesmen’s and delivery vehicles are included. There are few pavements on roads around the Village, and any increase in traffic would be likely to increase problems for pedestrians, who already feel in some danger.

Pedestrian access to site –concerns were expressed that the proposed pedestrian routes would compromise the privacy and security of some adjoining properties in Peper Harow Lane. The lack of room for a pedestrian walkway along the access roads to the Development, especially from Shackleford Road, was remarked upon.

Cricket Club – It appeared that the Development would not affect the playing of cricket, but there were fears that cricket balls could be hit into the gardens of some of the proposed new properties. Under S106 provisions the Developers had invited the Club to get prices for a new pavilion.

Playgrounds – it was felt that the existing playground, close to the Development, was adequate without the need for the provision of play facilities on site, which would tend to create a further division between the Village and the Development.

Cyder House Field – it was essential that the field be protected from any threat of future development.

Village School – soundings had been taken and it appeared that St. Mary’s could cope with the likely demand for places from new residents, but confirmation of the position was required.

Drainage – Using the Developers’ own figures, it appeared that 4000 gallons of waste water a day would be discharged into soakaways. Given the high water table and the inadequacy of the existing drains to deal with high levels of rainfall, it was felt that a significant threat was posed to surrounding properties.

Construction Management – Residents were concerned that there would be considerable disruption, heavy vehicle movements, and noise for the best part of two years. It was noted that it was proposed to commence working at 0730, and that there were provisions for possible night time working, which was considered unacceptable. Large numbers of HGV deliveries would inevitably be required resulting in potential congestion on the narrow residential roads around the site.

The Chairman thanked residents for their contribution, and assured them that all comments would be borne in mind by the Council in forming its response to the Planning Application – which would be made public.